

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 6, 2008 the Office noted that claims 24-33 were pending and rejected claims 24-33. Claims 32 and 33 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claim 34 has been added, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 24-34 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

In particular the Office asserts that the claims lack antecedent basis as they modify method claims with apparatus components.

The Applicants have amended the claims to more fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Krank, U.S. Patent No. 6,466,661 in view of Maloney, U.S. Patent No. 5,555,299 in further view of Hoffman 7,248,576. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the

rejection with an argument.

Krank discusses a method for establishing a connection in a communication network between a calling terminal (TE1) and a terminal (TE5) in a user group (UG) having a plurality of terminals (TE2, TE3, TE4, TE5, TE6).

As discussed in Krank, after a call request from the calling terminal (TE1) received at an exchange (PREX) of the network, a second terminal (TE4) of the user group requests information about the calling terminal (TE1). The exchange (PREX) sends the data for determining the calling terminal (TE1) to the second terminal (TE4) and, in response to an indication of acceptance by the second terminal (TE4), establishes a connection between the calling terminal (TE1) and the second terminal (TE4).

On page 3 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Krank, col. 1, lines 63-67; and col. 2, lines 1-11 disclose "this method comprising a phase for processing a call which is initiated each time a call is transmitted by a client and which comprises a step for establishing the co-ordination connection using an address of at least one of the two centres so that these centres can co-ordinate their respective operations for processing the first and second service requests from the client," as in claim 1.

However, the cited text does not disclose the use of two centres. Further, nothing in the cited reference disclose the use of an address of a centre. Additionally, nothing in the

cited text discusses processing the first and second service requests from the client. The Office does not assert and the Applicant has not found that Maloney and Hoffman disclose such a feature.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office asserts that Krank, col. 2, lines 1-11, lines 34-39; col. 3, lines 38-52; col. 5, lines 14-20; and col. 6, lines 3-13 discloses "in that one of the centres transmits its address to the other centre by inserting this address in one of the call control signals transmitted to the other centre," as in claim 1.

The Office further asserts since the address of the calling terminal sends a phone number, therefore the address is sent. However, the claims require that the address of the centre be inserted and sent. Not the address of the phone (i.e. terminal) as the Office states. The Office does not assert and the Applicant has not found that Maloney and Hoffman disclose such a feature.

On pages 3 and 4, the Office acknowledges that Krank does not disclose "establishing a co-ordination connection between a first and a second control centre for carrying out services in an intelligent telecommunications network," as in claim 24, instead asserting that Maloney, col. 2, lines 45-61 do.

Maloney discusses a method for transferring a call between pluralities of call centers. The method as in Maloney coordinates a voice component and a data component of the call

for permitting the calls transfer.

However, Maloney does not disclose establishing coordination connections between control centres for carrying out services (SCP centres) in an intelligent telecommunications network.

Hoffman adds nothing to the deficiencies of Krank and Maloney as applied to the independent claims.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Krank, Maloney and Hoffman, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 24, 32 and 33 and the claims dependent therefrom.

As Krank is silent as to a first and second service, it further does not disclose "wherein only the co-ordination connection is used to exchange co-ordination data for the respective operations for processing the first and second service requests implemented by the two centres for carrying out services," as in claim 26.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### NEW CLAIMS

Claim 34 is new. Support for claim 34 can be found, for example, in ¶ 0047 of the published Application. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the inclusion of claim 34. The prior art of record fails to disclose that the address of the centre is an IP network address.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 24-34 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston/  
James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg.No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/snt